SUBJECTS.

is requested to put what he has said in writing and sen same to that officer. The tariff value of *copra* will n raised.

III. PROTECTION.

(*1*) *Legislation.*

21. ***Appointment of a Member in the Legislative Council to represent the Jenmies.***

Mr. Eravithayar Pandarathil (Member, Jenmies o Quilon Division) said that there was at present no Me in the Legislative Council to represent the *Jenmies* their interests and consequently they were undergoing sev difficulties. The *Jenmies* were the owners of the bulk of landed properties in the State. In the Madras Legislat Council, there was a *Jenmi* Member. The Member said t in Travancore, he and others of his class were the real *Jenm* the other holders of land being in the nature of *Kudiya* The Laws and Regulations therefore affected them chie Under the rules regarding the constitution of the Counci was possible to put in a *Jenmi* Member. In consideration the above facts, and having regard to the present conditi of the *Jenmies*, he requested that a Member might be pointed in the Council to represent the interests of *Jenmies*.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

22. ***Amendment of the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation.***

Mr. Narayanar Kadambar Nambooripad (Member, J mies of the Kottayam Division) said that the difficult experienced by the *Jenmies* of Travancore were very gre as the tenants were intentionally harassing the former not paying them the customary dues. When pressed f the *michavarom*, *adukuvathu* and other dues, they usua questioned the right of the *Jenmi* to claim the dues, the by giving rise to unnecessary litigation. The Memb therefore requested that Section 17 of the Jenmi and Kud yan Regulation might be amended, so as to enfo the payment of the *michavarom*, *adukuvathu* and oth dues at stated periods and the recovery of double t dues from the *Kudiyans* in the event of default. The Me ber then said that Section 22 (*a*) of the Regulation also quired modification, as that Section laid down that t *pattom* on paddy lands should not exceed one-fourth of t gross produce. He said that the one-fourth *pattom* was t low and that the tenants could in no way be aggrieved if th *pattom* were raised to one-half, because landed proprietor other than the Brahmin *Jenmies* were realising one-half or even more as *pattom* on their lands. He therefore requested that the Government might carefully

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

consider his representation and modify the Regulation accordingly.

The Member also referred to the Dewan's reply at the Sixth Session to the representation of a *Jenmi* Member, and he requested that the enquiry therein promised might be ordered without delay, in view to ameliorate the condition of the *Jenmies*.

The Very Revd. Eippa Thoma Kathanar (Member Thiruvalla Taluk) said that the requests of the Brahmin and other *Jenmies* of Travancore were unjust and contrary to usage. He first referred to Mr. Eravithayar Pandarathil's request for the appointment of a *Jenmi* Member in the Legislative Council and said that, if that was going to be done, another Member to represent the interests of the *Kudiyans* or tenants should be simultaneously appointed.

Referring next to the modifications suggested in the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation, he stated that the Regulation was passed as the result of mature consideration, and it contained very wholesome provisions calculated to protect the interests alike of the *Jenmies* and the *Kudiyans*, and that the requests of individual *Jenmies* to make piecemeal modifications should not be considered. The Regulation was based upon a Proclamation of 1042, which itself came to be issued at a time when the beginnings of differences between the *Jenmies* and the *Kudiyans* were first seen. Till that year, both the *Jenmies* and the *Kudiyans* moved very amicably. Later on, the differences grew into litigation in the Courts, and so, as the result of an elaborate enquiry into the relations between the *Jenmies* and the *Kudiyans* and the nature of the transactions between them, a Regulation was passed in 1071. That Regulation had been so far working very well. He therefore said that there was no necessity for amending the Regulation in any respect.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

Repeal of Regulations I and IV of 1010.

Mr. S. Ganapathy Pillai (Member, Trivandrum Trading Classes) explained the origin of the two Regulations of 1010, and said that a perusal of the statute book of the country would show that most of the Regulations passed up to the year 1073 had been modified, if not completely repealed. Regulations I and IV of 1010 were no exception to the rule, and all that remained unrepealed of these Regulations were Section 7 and the 5th clause of Section 17 of the former, and Section 21 of the latter. The Member quoted these Sections *in extenso* and stated that, though these Regulations were intended to define the jurisdiction of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly